NEW CHRISTIAN

NOV.-DEC. 1957 EDITED BY KENNETH LESLIE

AN OPEN LETTER TO SIDNEY SMITH

By the Editor

THE BRINK AND SYRIA

By Louise Harding

BEATEN PATHS ARE FOR BEATEN MEN

By Fyke Farmer

CHRISTMAS SONG

Come, let us build the Christmas world today !
A world where every babe is holy born,
A world where motherhood is always blest.
Come! let us make of peace no more a jest !
No more a boast of our provincial scorn,
No more of charity a beast of prey.
Come! let the Convicting truth be all confessed,
The Earth's abundance could fill Plenty's horn
For every household all life's common way.
Come, then! and let us all together say
That until Christmas answers every morn
We will not cease to labor and protest.

—Robert Whitaker

Vol. XII, No. 12 30 cents

THE BRINK AND SYRIA

By Louise Harding

"We're sitting on a volcano, and it could erupt tomorrow. Any day could be our Pearl Harbor unless we're ready."—Vice Admiral Charles R. Brown, commander US Sixth Fleet, quoted in SF Chronicle, end of September.

"I pray that any war to come will be fought with some degree of sanity," he says. "I don't accept the argument that a shooting war would automatically go into an all-out nuclear fight. If it does it will be the end of civilization."

According to news by radio, he gave the order yesterday for his planes to take off and fire on a Russian plane which he considered too near his position in eastern Mediterranean. A pilot who actually did fire, says, "*I was ready to fire the first shot in World War III,*" but the Russ plane outflew them and vanished over Bulgaria.

What is the Sixth Fleet doing in the eastern Mediterranean? Evidently acting according to the declaration of Leroy Henderson, who after his recent visit to Turkey asserted that the situation in the Middle East was "very serious."

After Saudi Arabia and Jordan said they saw no "Communist threat" in Syria, and Egypt threatened to close the Canal again, Dulles (and Eisenhower) retreated, Dulles saying (9-10) that the "Eisenhower" doctrine apparently won't be usable in Syria"—he doesn't think Syria will make an overt attack; but that if one comes, Syria's neighbors are capable of protecting themselves.

On the 7th, Eisenhower, according to a White House communique, "affirmed his intention to carry out the national policy expressed in the congressional Middle East resolution which has been adopted, and exercise as needed the authority thereby conferred on the President..... The President expressed the hope that the International Communists would not push Syria into any acts of aggression against her neighbors...."

He forgot one little word which is important. The resolution says OVERT aggression.

There is another clause in the so-called Eisenhower doctrine, that careless U.S. chauvinists overlook: the Resolution requires that the Arab states formally demand aid from USA; and (Sept. 13) King Saud was reported to have urged Eisenhower to use a policy of moderation toward Syria. Jordan and Iraq say they will join Syria if that country is attacked. They see no Communist threat in Syria.

An item of Aug. 19 came from London, stating that the British Foreign Office disclaimed any special feelings of anxiety over the situation in Syria. "Privately, British officials expressed the view that the extent to which Syria has been brought under Kremlin control has been exaggerated."

AP, Sept. 5, commenting on the Henderson visit, wrote:

"Actually the Eisenhower Doctrine has been at least partially invoked for some time since the United States has been sending arms to Middle East countries and extending economic aid to nations requesting it.

"The doctrine also provides that the President can send U.S. troops to any nation threatened by Communist aggression or subversion provided the Middle East country asks for them. . . ."
—It provides nothing of the sort: there must be an *actual armed attack:* nothing whatever said about a country *thinking it is threatened* (see Report on Hearings before the Com. on For. Relations and Com. on Armed Services, US Senate, commencing January 11, this year.)

Sept. 6, Washington, AP, Eisenhower was reported planning a "strongly-worded declaration pledging support for Jordan, Lebanon and other pro-Western Mideast countries. The presidential declaration (diplomatic officials) said would be aimed at "bolstering friendly governments which fear that Communist gains in nearby Syria may embolden Reds within their own borders."
—This has nothing to do with "armed Communist aggression." But it was obvious from the beginning that the "Eisenhower" (Dulles) Resolution was a formula for war, as the recent attempt to use it demonstrates.

"National Guardian" (NY) reports that C. D. Jackson, Henry Luce associate, arch warmonger, and adviser to Eisenhower on psychological warfare until quite recently)
"reportedly asserted in Toronto that 'the U.S. had touched off the Middle East crisis to force a showdown with Russia' (Washington Post 3/5) ; that the U.S. offer to help finance Egypt's Hgih Dam was withdrawn to 'call Moscow's bluff,' and that the State Dept. was fully aware that Egypt might nationalize the Canal in retaliation."

It may be remembered that Dulles administered that blow in the face to Egypt very shortly after Egypt had recognized China. Your scribe has always thought that fact significant.

The London paper "Freedom" says it is reported from Syria that the West had laid down as condition for economic and military aid, that Syria have nothing to do with the Soviet bloc.

Syria Threatened

"Petroleum Week" (McGraw-Hill) carried a story, Nov. 16, last year, about a plan to partition Syria between Iraq and Turkey. The reason: uneasiness over the oil pipelines crossing the country.

"Turkey would take a relatively small slice of upper Syria, but it would include the big, key city of Aleppo.

"Iraq would get the larger portion of Syria, including the Mediterranean coastline, the port city of Latakia, and Syria's capital, Damascus.

An item from Damascus is quoted by S. Mateo Times, Aug. 13:

"Syria accused the United States today of plotting to overthrow President Shukri Kuwatly's government.

An official government statement charged the United States had signified willingness to pay Syria between 300 and 400 million dollars in aid if Damascus changed governments and made peace with Israel.

Political quarters here said Syria would lodge a strong protest with the United States .... The statement charged:

The United States assigned an intelligence agent, identified as Howard Stone, to conspire with Shishekly and Husseini. Stone was described as 'the United States' No. 1 expert on coup d'etats,' who previously 'organized similar plots in Sudan and Iran and was behind the American coup d'etat in Guatemala in 1955 ....

The group contacted Syrian officers, but some of them reported the plot to Kuwatly's government, the statement added.

Talking to Gen. Bizri, chief of staff of the Syrian army, Drew Pearson also heard of such a plot. Bizri said: "Those whom we asked to leave our country were the most active. They had contacts with civilians and with military officers plotting against our regime and to kill me. What the Americans did not know was that these officers immediately reported to me."

Dulles Said It.

(Quoted by "Catholic Worker" (NY,)

"In order to bring a nation to support the burdens incident to maintaining great military establishments(, it is necessary to create an emotional state akin to war psychology. There must be the portrayal of an external menace or of internal conditions rendered intolerable by the unjust restraints of foreign nations. This involves the development to a high degree of the nation-hero, nation-villain ideology and the arousing of the population to a sense of the duty of sacrifice.

"Thus the creation of vast armament in itself calls for a condition midway between war and peace. Mass emotion on a sub stantial scale is a prerequisite. The willingness to sacrifice must be engendered. A sense of peril from abroad must be cultivated. Once these conditions exist we have gone a long way on the path toward war."

John Foster Dulles, in 'War, Peace and Change,'
Harper & Bros. NY 1939, pp. 90-91)

Warmongers, and "Rosie" Campaign

The situation in the Mediterranean would give less cause for alarm, if officers of extreme reactionary tendencies were not almost sure to be in command. The Sixth Fleet, moving about near the west coast of Syria, at the time the present regime seized power in Jordan, dubbed its maneuvers "Rosie". This writer heard a radio reporter say in this connection, that the ways of Navy men

were "inscrutable." But your scribe recollected at once, how Emmet O'Donnell (March Air Base, 18 Jan. 1951) had advocated the use of the "ultimate weapon" against China. Asked by a reporter to be more specific, he said: "*The atomic bomb. They'll understand the lash when it's put to them.*"

They said, NO !

Meantime, how fares it with some of the few brave humans who have dared to stand up against the warmongers, with resolution, and against vast odds?

Atty. *Fyke Farmer* is appealing a decision of Judge Miller, in US District Court. Mr. Farmer is not getting the publicity, nor the financial support, that he richly deserves: his former lucrative law practice is practically gone, needless to say. Here is the Miller decision—which anyone can compare with the judgments made at Nurenberg:

> The court does not agree that there exists a principle of international law operating to relieve citizens from their tax obligations and liabilities under the local laws of their country, or imposing upon them individual responsbility for the use made of tax revenue. No precedent for such a view has been cited and it finds no support in the language or purpose of any international engagement to which this country is a party. The Nurenburg Judgment was based upon altogether different facts and does not support the theories of immunity here advanced."

—The Nurenburg decisions *were not based on local laws of any country.* A precedent cannot be cited: *they were unprecedented.* And if this decision be allowed to stand, a complete nullification will have been achieved.

The Farmers Union of Iowa, under its fighting head, Fred Stover, keeps up the unequal struggle in which it became involved because of its exposures about the War on Korea. In reply to its suit for heavy damages against radio station WHO for an attack on Mr. Stover, a preposterous set of interrogatories was brought into court, demanding that Stover produce for the consideration of the court everything of a political nature *that he had ever written!* (Thus helping them to try to find some foundation for the attack.) This seems too absured to be true; but it is a fact. Due to the powerful interests behind the defending corporation, the case has dragged along, with the evident hope that the farmers' exchequer would go broke.

Now, however, the noted and valiant attorney, Mr. Royal W. France, has taken the case. If this important struggle gets the financial backing that would certainly be furnished in any land where love of liberty is strong, something important will be forthcoming before too long.

The United States does possess men of unflinching recolution today, as it did yesterday' but in what a terrible minority !

The Furies and the Rosenbergs.

Time passes slowly in the penitentiary. U. S. Reaction is busy, seeking outs for its purchased scientists' failure to keep up with Soviet Russia in the matter of missiles—excuses are in demand, no matter how ridiculous. So, when the Senate subcommittee protecting U.S. securities—beg pardon, Security—dropped in to see Dave Greenglass and Harry Gold (self-confessed spies) in the Federal pen. at Lewisburg, and these two worthies produced further stories about Julius and Ethel Rosenberg—which, despite their harrowing character, had somehow escaped their memories all these years—the resultant grist was just what the doctor ordered for our native fascists and collaborators with fascists, at this time when the public has to be reconciled to unbalanced budgets or else rises in taxes already destroying the economy.

Greek mythology had its tale about the Erinyes, who pursued criminals (only) beyond the grave and tortured them in Hades. Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, burned to death by electricity on the most shamefully-flimsy evidence, at the behest of builders of hysteria attempting to cover the illegal fiasco of the War on Korea, are now libelled by one Robert Morris, attorney for the aforesaid committee of the Senate. The Rosenbergs are no longer here: they cannot protest the outrage. But one wonders whether the people of this country have been so intimidated, their thinking apparatus so warped, that they are unable to detect this latest arrant fraud. Or, do the forces of fascism among us underestimate the listeners to radio and readers of the daily "news" papers?— It has been said that, just as unused muscles in our anatomies wither away after a time, so the moral faculties, long shrugged aside in cowardice and indifference, no longer respond to provocation of the gravest sort—become atrophied. Has such a deterioration, in fact over taken the public in these USA? If not, we should be hearing vigorous denunciations of Morris and his yarn.

From the tale now being peddled, it would appear that the Rosenbergs had got hold of "earth-satellite, atom-powered plane, and anti-missile secrets" and handed them over to the Russians "soon after World War II." Where they managed to get this information is not considered worth mentioning. As earth satellites and atom-powered planes were not in preparation at that time, mayhap psychic powers were called on to learn these mysteries. As to missiles, the Nazis were the ones who knew about them: turning to the strongest side, after defeat, Hitler's merry boys told U.S. militarists all about such deviltries. (The indictment against the Rosenbergs never charged them with giving anything whatsoever to our then-time allies: only that they *conspired* to that effect.)

Russia, we are now asked to infer, went ahead and used these plans in order to make the Sputniks and the mechanism that sent them into space. U.S., on the contrary—although having this know-

ledge longer than Russia—somehow or other only created mechanisms far inferior: a circumstance of great peculiarity, seeing that our overall know-how (to say nothing of our money power) is vastly superior.

Sounds silly? Well, it is as plausible as the rest of the claims put forward in this case: to-wit, the Rosenbergs handed over "secrets"—that every informed person knows were no secrets at all. Thereby (see "Judge" Kaufman) they caused the deaths of unnumbered U.S. soldiers in the war in Korea—that was no war since it was never authorized by Congress: if anything, it was an act of Piracy.) For which benefit to the Enemy—who was then an Ally, and has never since been officially declared an enemy (being so designated only by Dulles and other cartelists and their underlings) they were richly rewarded by the Soviets—but died so poor that all the worldly goods they had to leave their children were some paltry personal belongings in a few pasteboard cartons.

In the aforesaid dire deeds, when Greenglass and his wife confessed that they were implicated, Ruth Greenglass got off scot free: Dave got fifteen years in the jug (a sentence which can be reduced for conduct deemed sufficiently satisfactory—in certain quarters—ahem!)

The Rosenbergs—*the Supreme Court never having reviewed the evidence,*—were executed. Brownell, the anti-laborite, and part of the Tom Dewey (Rockefeller) N.Y. machine, assured Eisenhower, we are told that the accusations against the defendants were justified beyond all doubt, according to undisclosed facts in the possession of the said Brownell—could they have been the betrayal of those invaluable "secrets", filched from U.S.A., which enabled Communist Russia to deal Corporation-Dominated America that Sputnik bodyblow?—Oh yes, I forgot to mention that "space platforms" was one of them.

Another part of the new Munchausen fabrication, told at the committee hearing by "a former Soviet army officer," is that, between 1944 and 1947, the Russ kidnapped some two thousand odd German scientists, lugged them behind that "iron curtain" invented by Goebbels (Churchill pirated the term), and compelled them to use their brains on missiles, chemicals, and such like.

Pap, supposed to be swallowed by us yokels, comes thick and fast, these days.

Your scribe, monitoring the radio, heard it all peddled with gusto, over KFRC, by Cedric Foster, who reminded us, gleefully, that, despite remonstrances by "do-gooders," as Foster put it, the Rosenbergs were duly executed. Murder is a better word for it. Foster said flatly, that Julius and Ethel Rosenberg nullified the efforts of "our" best brains, and enabled Russia to get ahead in the great "race for survival" (of Monopoly Capitalism).

What hideous warmongering! Those best informed have already said they saw no threat of armed attack from Russia.

Logic, also, says there is no reason to anticipate such an attack. What Plutocracy dreads from Russia and China is "SUBVERSION", and demonstrations to the world of what Industrial Democracy can do to put Sputniks in the heavens and food in stomachs long robbed of same by czarist and Chinese-warlord pals of Dulles and his kind—by pillagers and Do-Badders, buttressed by capitalist lickspittles.

—Later: The very next day after this latest anti-Rosenberg bilge appeared in the press, then came the aforesaid Robert Morris, in a public plea that the two imprisoned spies used as authority for this stuff, *be forthwith turned loose.* Wouldn't you think he would have sense enough to wait at least a month or two? But, whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad!

BEATEN PATHS ARE FOR BEATEN MEN

By Fyke Farmer

> "It is the mark of our present age, and its supreme irony, that each new step toward the perfection of nuclear destructive capability and toward the development of missiles to deliver nuclear bombs over long distances reduces every nation's security."
>
> *San Francisco Chronicle,* May 15, 1957, p. 16

So long as the theory that the way to prevent war is for a strong nation to be strong enough militarily to win the next war prevails, it will continue thus. Ever since Winston Churchill, when he was first Secretary of the English Admirality in 1912, projected the theory it has been in decay. Britain's victor's losses from two world wars have posted proof of how fallacious it was.

Today, the decay of the theory that national security can be found in sufficient capacity to make war has reached the stage of putrescence. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, on October 11, 1957 addressing the international affairs division of the General Federation of Women's Clubs at the Pentagon, said that the United States should regard military might as "a holding action while the necessary political adjustments are being made" and effective means are worked out to maintain law and order in the world without war. "Holding" what? we are compelled to ask?

How much longer will we delay setting up the international judical system to maintain law that will effectively abolish the in-

stitution of war? Sputnik's "beeps" call out all over the world for the answer. "Beaten paths are for beaten men."

Let us make no mistake about it: war as an institution is extant in the world today because of the system of law which has supported it. In many respects it is like the institution of chattel slavery which was maintained through law.[17]

Sir Henry Sumner Maine, delivering the Whewell Lectures on the mitigation of war before the University of Cambridge in 1887, devoted a considerable part of his dissertation to the *status* of war. Formerly, he pointed out, the first consequence of a state of war between two nations was, that every subject of the one nation became in the eye of the law an enemy to every subject of the other nation. The learned author took as his text for an illuminating discussion the Manual prepared for English officers just after the close of the Civil War in the United States. This Manual after stating the above principle followed with a statement of the contradictory principle that "war is not a relation of man to man, but of state to state, and in itself implies no private hostility between the individuals by whom it is carried on." "They are enemies" according to the Manual, "only in their character as soldiers, and not as men."

Maine explains the contrasting statements by showing that the first represented the theory of the law if an attempt had been made to express it at the period of Greek classical antiquity—supporting his reasoning by passages from Thucydides, recurring frequently, that they killed the man, and the women and children they reduced to slavery. The second proposition, Maine asserted, "represents a new theory to which the world has generally advanced." *(International Law, by Maine, Henry Holt & Co., New York: 1888,* pages 131-133).

The third proposition—one to which the world has advanced since Maine lectured—is that while war is a relation of state to state, individuals are entitled to exempt themselves from having any part in it, if the Government makes war contrary to its treaty obligations or for aggression.[18]

The disarmament negotiations since World War II have been stalled for a long time over the problem of effective controls that will provide mutual safeguards against violation of any disarmament treaty that might be reached. There is a way to break this impasse. It is to set up a system for the individual citizens of every nation.[19] Of such nature are the "political adjustments" which are necessary to maintain law and order in the world without war.

It is a commonplace saying that we are today living in a new age. But isn't every age, for that matter, a new one? Let us consider, for a moment, the evolution of the concept of crime (Lat. *crimen,* accusation). The Encyclopedia Brittannica (11th edition, perhaps the most scholarly one) on the subject Crime states:

"Crimes vary with times and countries. Under different circumstances of place and custom, that which at one time is denounced as a crime, at another passes as a meritorious act. It was once an imperative duty for the family to avenge the death of a kinsman, and the blood feud had a sanction that made killing no murder. Again, among primitive tribes to make away with parents at an advanced age or suffering from an incurable disease was an act of filial duty. Polyandry was sometimes encouraged, and cannibalism practised with general approval; religious sentiment elevated into heinous crimes, blasphemy, heresy, sacrilege, sorcery, and even science when it ran counter to accepted degmas of the church. Offense multiplied when people gathered into communities and the rights of property and of personal security were understood and established. The law of the strongest might still interfere with individual ownership; the weakest went to the wall; authority, whether exercised by one master or by the combined government of the many, was resisted, and this resistance constituted crime. As civilization spread and the bulk of the population settled into orderliness, society for its own comfort, convenience and protection, would not tolerate the infraction of its rules, and rising against all lawbreakers decreed reprisals against them as the common enemy."

The time when the organization and building of the means for mass destruction of human life and property in other nations to carry out some national policy is considered a meritorious act is passing. "Law," Elbert Hubbard said, "limps and lags behind life." Law, however, took a long step forword to catch up with life when the leading nations of the world unamimously approved the principle of individual responsibility for the "supreme international crime" of war.[20] Let us hope that the establishment of the institutions necessary to the enforcement of the principle will not lag too far behind scientific progress.

"Once to every man and nation," the poet has written, "comes the moment to decide" between truth and falsehood. The writer of this brief has made his decision for the truth that only a decade ago—before the "cold war" was well-started—was applauded by the masses of humanity as the break-through of the system which for centuries has held mankind in the thralldom of military servitude—a form of slavery and human degradation ten times worse than chattel slavery ever was. By a curious, but by no means uncommon, reaction, the truth that promised to all nations liberation from the curse of war has been set back by the falsehood of another futile arms race.

Appellant has been doing all that it was humanly possible for him as one individual to do to keep the truth from being unrecognizably mutilated and forever trampled under foot into the

dust. Now, he has acquitted himself to his own conscience.

The moment for decision for or against that truth has devolved upon two judges who have already sat in this case. Judge Davies, in his moment, acquitted himself to his own conscience one way; Judge Miller's conscience, when his moment came, did not direct him to take the same course.

The case, when this brief is read, will be on the consciences of three more judges. It is for each to acquit himself to his own conscience.

With this one observation, appellant will rest his case: If the basis upon which Judge Miller decided against appellant's case is sustained, the vital principle that could bring the law up to adequacy to control the development of the scientific means of destructiveness at man's disposal will have been snuffed out. If no judicial examination of the question of the legality of the participation of the United States Government in the Korean war can be had, no acts of the national authorities of whatever nation in ordering and carrying on a war will ever be judicially reviewable until after the holocaust of World War III; for the principle of Judge Miller's decision forbids *any* judicial inquiry into the legality of *any* war by national courts. International courts, of course, will not be set up by the heads of governments which continue the arms race and employing threats of nuclear destruction for diplomatic ends. Manifestly if the determination of the question whether a particular war is a crime can be made only by the very same political authorities responsible for initiating and waging the war, no war will ever be held criminal. Neither will the political authorities recognize the right of the citizens of their country to abstain from supporting and countenancing their war activities.

In this aspect, Judge Miller's decision is a reversion to the ancient and repudiated doctrine that every citizen is a party to the act of his own Government and is bound by it. It denies the right of every man to champion law in the interest of society and peace. Our espousal of this doctrine would render hypocritical the scorn so many level at the Soviet system by which, it is insisted, the individual has no standing or rights of his own but is mere pawn of the State. If their system on this account is a threat to the peace, will our operating on the same principles be less of a threat to the peace?

Henry L. Stimson, in an article in Foreign Affairs, for January 1947, entitled NUREMBERG: LANDMARK IN LAW said:

> "A standard has been raised to which Americans, at least, must repair; for it is only as this standard is accepted,

supported and enforced that we can move onward to a world of law and peace."

17. Mr. Justice Curtis dissenting in the Dred Scott case said that "...not only must the **status** of slavery be created and measured by municipal law, but the rights, powers and obligations which grow out of that **status** must be defined, protected and enforced by such laws." **Scott v. Sandford, 19 How. 393, 626, 15 Led 691, 792.**

18. Lord Justice Lawrence, the Presiding Judge of the International Military Tribunal, in an article "The Nuremberg Trial" published in **International Affairs**, Vol. XXIII, April 1947, page 151, 153, said: "...the fundamental purpose of the trial was not only the punishment of those who were guilty but the establishment of the supremacy of international law over national law..."

19. Prof. Georg Schwarzenberger of the Faculty of Laws, University College, London, Editor of Current Legal Problems, has made the constructive suggestion that the only hope for development in that direction will be for one of the sides in the current power struggle to set an example by first taking the beam out of its own eye before demanding the mote be removed from the eyes of the opposite power: Said Prof. Schwarzenberger: "...all international criminal law that is meant to be applied to world powers is a contradiction in terms. It presupposes an international authority which is superior to these States. In reality, however, any attempt to enforce an international criminal code against either the Soviet Union or the United States would be war under another name. Thus, proposals for a universal international criminal law fall in the category of the one-way pattern for reorganization of international society.* With other schemes of the type they share the deficiency of takingfor granted an essential condition of their realization, a sine qua non which cannot easily be attained; the transformation of the present system of world politics in disguise into at least a world federation. If and when, the swords of justice are taken from their present guardians, then, and only then, will the international community be strong enough to wield the sword of criminal justice.

*A more promising, though less ambitious line of development might be the creation of international criminal law within each of the two halves of present-day international society. If either side were content to look not primarily at the international 'crimes' committed by the other, but set to work to remedy the deficiencies within its own world, then proposals for an international criminal law might lose some of their less attractive ideological features and even claim a certain educational value. International criminal law might then contribute to the articulate formulation of the positive values for which the Western and Eastern worlds stand."

"The Problem of an International Criminal Law", **Current Legal Problems,** 1950, page 296.

20. Herbert Wechsler (Columbia University) in a paper read at the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, Dec. 30, 1948, published in 62 Pol. Sc. Q. page 11 (Mar. 1947) said: "...Nuremberg, far more than San Francisco, was the assumption of an irrevocable obligation—to build a world of just law that shall apply to all with institutions strong enough to carry it into effect."

December 16, 1957

Hon. Sidney Smith,
Minister of External Affairs,
Canadian Delegation to the NATO Conference,
Paris, France.

Dear Mr. Smith,—

This letter is about Canadian survival. The name of the Canadian-Soviet Friendship magazine "Northern Neighbors" points to the fact that we are close neighbors to the Soviet Union, as close, in these ICBM days, as Finland.

A map is enclosed with this letter. I cut it out of the N.Y. Times in 1952. It is called "U.S. Air Bases Around the World." They do circle the globe, and most of them cluster within striking distance of the USSR. This map and others you have seen of army and naval bases and of distant territories and vast oceans controlled by US forces show clearly that the US is doing more than just preparing to strike at Russia. In the words of the late George Marion the US "seeks literally global strategic hegemony," in other words is engaged in *boundless expansion.*

Such expansion meets and will continue to meet a certain degree of resistance wherever it goes. Up to now, however, the resistance of the victim has often been dissipated as the aggressor calls upon the victim to join the aggressor in the great crusade against Russia.

The Soviet Union, from 1917 to 1957, has been under numerous severe handicaps in replying to our 40-year Cold War, which began, it should be remembered, as a series of hot wars and reached a climax in the devastating fascist invasion. Weakened, disillusioned, wounded, the Soviet people worked, sacrificed, studied! They built a productive plant. They went undersea with a submarine fleet. They went into the air with ICBM which needs no foreign bases.

Visiting the Soviet Union last month when the sputniks were fresh in the minds of the people I found no swaggering or boasting but quiet confidence and a feeling as if heavy threatening clouds had at long last been lifted from their horizons. They had found an answer to the prolonged agony of the Cold War. The Cold war, any great power conflict, is stalemated. Sane people will realize this fact. Those who refuse to face it and who continue to act as if it were not a fact must be restrained by their fellows.

Twice recently you have spoken out against the American habit of rejecting Soviet proposals "out of hand." In doing this you have shown a sense of reality and have echoed the sentiments of Canadians of all parties. Facing the real possibility of world

suicide we are glad you perceive the necessity for a change of attitude. And this brings us to the question as to what can be done to help your opposite numbers in the US also to perceive this necessity as it arises out of the change that has come about in power relationships.

The American Secretary of State said to a recent White House press conference: "Because of our great spiritual strength we will triumph in the end." But spiritual strength means strength to face facts and this is exactly where the US fails. Thousands of instances could be cited of this fear of facts. I shall mention one in detail because it is extremely pertinent to our present situation.

This is from the leading editorial (Nov. 26/57) in the York (Pa) *Gazette and Daily*, a prosperous capitalist newspaper whose editor possesses the spiritual strength to expose this spiritual weakness of his country. He is discussing Russian or rather Soviet education:

> "One thing we have apparently discovered — something that could have been discovered long ago—is that the Russians pay a lot of attention to education, particularly scientific and technical education.
>
> "A report issued by the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare on the Soviet education system made this clear. But hardly had the report been released when the person who wrote the original report protested that it had been distorted by editing. Mrs. Eleanor S. Lowman wrote the department that the edited version failed among other things, to include the fact that the Russians get as extensive a foundation in the liberal arts as they do in science.
>
> "Now this may not seem logical to us. Liberal actually means, in this connection, liberating or humanizing. And how can liberating arts be a major part of an education system in a totalitarian society like that of the Soviet Union? That is a very important question, to which we ought to try and get factual answers. But instead, since instruction in the liberal arts in Russia conflicts with the ideas of the powers-that-be in Washington, Mrs. Lowman's facts are simply omitted from a published report.
>
> "This is the kind of thing that no nation which wishes to conduct itself intelligently and to devise sensible policies can afford."

Here is no evidence of spiritual strength, but rather of moral cowardice. Another evidence of moral cowardice is this generosity in passing out atomic missiles to Nato countries, thus assuring them of the earliest possible attention from the enemy is case of war. The latest pronouncement of Mr. Dulles definitely smacks

of panic as he envisages "the possibility of having a highly organized military unity without political unity." No doubt he is confident that the Nazi general at the head of Nato forces will understand how to forge "a highly organized military unity." Apparently Mr. Dulles is a crafty madman, using Mr. Eisenhower as a stalking-horse, headed straight for war and fascism, war on *your* territory and fascism on *his*. He has been the evil genius of the Cold War.

When the US, physically strengthened by World War II, rich and fat from war profits, re-opened the Cold War against a Russia bled white in the allied effort, this new Cold War was diabolically designed to exhaust and frustrate the efforts of the USSR to rebuild her country by forcing her to divert all her energies into defence.

Implacably Dulles and his principals set about playing the boa constrictor. But the victim through superhuman efforts has sputniked his way free, and somehow he, Dulles, has got his coils twisted back upon themselves, and he begins to learn the meaning of frustration. In desperation he begins handing out these missiles or hypothetical missiles (some of them are apparently still on paper).

I have just heard the CBC report of Mr. Eisenhower's opening speech at Nato. It is predicated upon the continuance of the Cold War. But if the premise of the Cold War is shattered, then the Cold War is over. The whole world outside Mr. Dulles's office knows it is over. Canada with its obsolete DEW line knows it is over. And we are all glad it is over, so we can get on with constructive enterprises.

Why not say so, Mr. Smith? Why not tell Nato that the time has come to talk to the Russians and to negotiate with them orderly processes of peace in every part of the world in which there are differences of opinion. Why not serve notice that Canada will not continue in partnership with any power carrying on the Cold War, and that Canada will not remain host to external armies in our North, all fitted out with nuclear weapons making us a sitting duck in case of a war, which, given the continued guidance of US affairs by Dulles, is inevitable.

I believe the people of Canada want no war with the Soviet Union, cold or hot. I believe the Canadians want to play hockey with the Russians and watch their ballerinas dance. I think they want you to insist on negotiation with the USSR and to insist on Canadian participation at top levels.

A huile latha chi's nach faic

NEW CHRISTIAN

Nov.-Dec. 1957

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I. Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etianne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, Elmsdale, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**